EIGHTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL STUDENT FESTIVAL

Humboldt State University

Comments on films by Festival judge, Don Lloyd, Artist
San Francisco Art Institute
Experimental Filmmaker

FLAPPERETTE:
Caril Willat

Filmmaking seems to be a heavy business these days, attracting very serious minded people, so when they attempt film humor it is heavy handed. Flapperette provided a much-needed relief.

FATHER:
Stanley Salfas

I was very impressed by the clarity and ease in the subjective-time editing, and by the lack of a com-' pulsion to fill up the whole frame which often spoils short dramas like this.

USC, FIELD OF HONOR:

Industrial Jerry Lewis at its worst. Outdated when first developed 20 years ago.

MARIE:
Geoffrey de Valois

One of the braver films in the festival in its use of unsafe and unusual material. Poetry and film seldom work together, and they don't really work that well in this film but they almost do and that's an achievement. It's too short to be as discontinuous as it is, though it does manage to establish a mood.

HOOKERS:
George Paul Csicsery

This film is frustrating because it has so much going for it yet doesn't come off. It is dishonest in presenting the Hookers' Ball as an entirely positive event, and its reliance upon standard TV documentary style flattens the subject out; I believe quite a bit is glossed over here, unless you're planning a sequel called PIMPS.

WHY?:
Fred Szymanski

One of my personal favorites in the festival. I liked the rough edges and rumble sound track. It's delicate, in that if the audience gets involved it really works and if they don't, it doesn't work at all.

ROSEBLOOD:
Sharon Couzin

This film requires many viewings. It's certainly the best of the optical printing films, using these techniques as direct expression rather than as graphics. It seems very handcrafted, direct and personal, and until I see it a few more times anyway, puzzling.

BLACK ORIFICE:
Ross Albert

A pleasant discovery; the first strobe film I've seen that is successful in transforming the theater into a different space; I find the sound a little atavistic but it doesn't really detract. I would like to see it silent sometime.

BRIGHT LITES:
Eric Anderson

Carefully done and well paced, but it just doesn't ever quite transcend its own original subject; relies too much on the music to generate a sense of mystery.

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS:
John Saffron

The characters seem somewhat subjected to the political aims of the script; I don't feel them as real people though I recognize the situation as very real; a bit slow and inexorable. One beautiful touch is her turning the light back on and looking around the apartment - I began to like her then, but otherwise the people in the film were puppets to the all too plodding logical dialectic.

REALWORLD:
Brian Reisman

I enjoyed the farce until about halfway through. It just didn't develop. In fact it degenerated into a copy of Hollywood, falling apart like the overblown Blake Edwards comedies. Satire isn't satire when it simply imitates.

CYBERNETIC LEGACY:
Robert Norby

A well executed little joke film but, I'm afraid the joke has been told a million times during the last century and it is a bit stale by now (maybe because we are closer to 1993)

REFLECTIONS OF MAN:
USC

Speak for yourself.

HOBART MILLARD:
Edward Stabile

As a mood piece, this is excellent. A good sense of pacing. I'm not too sure about the use of stills in the beginning, and there are a few stock shots that clink a little bit (like the face in the window seen from a camera moving down the street). I liked the oblique character development, such as not really showing the face of the main evildoer and the long closeups on his partner.

DESPARATES:
Paul Brekke

The garbage can sequence had such promise until the color separations took it off in another direction, i.e., metamorphosis through change rather than transformation, to use a metaphor that seems to mean something to you. I did feel like I was making a series of little discoveries through the first part of the film, but then it seemed to wander off for the sake of wandering off and I wasn't too involved by the end.

APARTMENT 3:
Nelson Muche

This kind of short sketch is always a good project and it does seem a little bit like an assignment. Nothing really happens with these images; no atmosphere is generated, no mood or associations triggered; I just don't get the point.

MESSAGES:
Lynn Hamrick

Putting out the cigarette on the lens: great. Otherwise, I must confess that my response to the film is political rather than aesthetic, and I react against portraits of women as spoiled victims of ennui, not knowing what to do with themselves without a man around.

DESERT WATCH:
USC

Beautiful potential in the visuals and a nice choice of subject, but the reading in the soundtrack is so lifeless and uninteresting that the portrait fails to involve me. Some nice visuals.

LUCKY DAY:
William Morroni, Jr.

You've got the editing technique of mounting catastrophe almost down pat. It triggers the imagination to continue the avalanche after the film ends.

SLEEP WALK:
Michael Wallin

One of the few films from which I actually learned something about people. People's gestures caught my attention the whole rest of the evening. I'll be looking forward to see what you do next.

SWAG:
Bruce Postman

I didn't see your Boobs last year but I really enjoyed your Swag this year. Amazing acting from such young people. The cutting around the restaurant was a little confusing (because it wasn't really a restaurant?) and I would have liked to see a few more closeups on faces but even so your character development is remarkably vivid.

TANGRAM AND SPECIAL NEWS REPORT:
Alan Slasor

I don't respond much to design film, permutation of a set, unless the complication is so extreme that technique becomes a factor. I thought NEWS was very good satire, well-wroked out and fun to watch.

NOTES:
Barry Strugatz

Perfect choice of theme music. Clarity of voice in 16mm optical track is marginal at best, and someone who talks fast has a lot going against him. The overall structure is good, the acting seems adequate, and your approach pretty straightforward, but somehow the spirit didn't fly.

TRANSMAN:
Jim Johnson

It seems to me that you may have been overcome by the potential power of your imagery and didn't know how to handle it. I find the film way too repetitious: the 'marvel' doesn't hold up. The weak point is the lack of any pacing or sense of buildup. It seems you wanted to build up to some kind of musically climactic ending, but to do that you have to establish some rhythm and tension in the first place in order to have something to resolve. These are just ideas spliced together and not taken anywhere.

SHEETS:
Harry Dodson

Fairly successful rendering of daydream esoteria. I found the word games a bit simplistic, not allowing me to make my own associations, but perhaps this tension works in the film to motivate the ending. I think it will sustain a number of viewings.

STAR DUST:
USC

Obviously I'm not supposed to feel like I've known the man after seeing this little tribute, but I did find it mildly entertaining.

BETHLEHEM:
Robert Thurber

Incredible non-presence of camera in the environment, a la Wiseman. A little trouble getting black faces to show up on under-exposed black and white film, which made trying to understand the boys' emotions occasionally difficult. I became very involved while watching this film, as if I had spent all that time working on the documentary myself. This should be shown around. Have you tried PBS?

DL:llb
5/21/75

EIGHTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL STUDENT FESTIVAL

Humboldt State University

Comments on films by Festival judge, Carel Rowe
San Francisco State University
Filmmaker, Film Critic
Published in Film Quarterly

DESERTWATCH - Excellent documentary topic but suffers from the imposition of "wrong" (lyric) style on "hard" content. Becomes too removed, too romanticized to be authentic; much of this is due to the quality of narration, the interior monologue belied by the "re-enactment" reading of the narrator's voice. Excellent visual handling of landscape.

IT'S YOUR LUCKY DAY: Highly successful comic vision of entrapment between two media (phone, tv) and the results of living too close to any medium in this country. Suggestion: Omit two or three of the last cross-cutting sequence and bring in the end music 15-20 seconds earlier. Tighten up the fianl sequence to preserve quick pace achieved earlier in film.

NEVADA FALLS: Excellent control of superimposition but a bit like a kind of plastic Brakhage due to overmanipulation of nature as remembered vision/experience. In many places this worked but too often it is overworked: we are made aware of how well nature is being artfully manipulated, strategies show; this makes form self-conscious, precious.

CIRQUE MEMOIRE: Deliciously imagistic and an improvement on the "real" circus experience: a circus of a movie of a circus. Only criticism would be that there are times when optical overkill made the action (the natural grace) static.

SLEEPWALK: Almost a linguistic analysis of structure of motion. The three "narratives" set-up and carry the "message"- letting the film "take off". Visual deconstruction of motion into repeated gestures as "modular units" are free to develop rythmically; film "answers" questions it posits, orchestrates the "meaningless babble" of life.

SWAG: Visually self-confident although conservative, one of the most effective New York Neo-Realist pieces. Filmmaker had ethnographer's sense of presenting a cultural study; the division of classes clear and the study of the ways in which each survive, see the world clearly developed; their interaction producing almost "inevitable" results. Visually better handling of exteriors than interiors, interiors too expressionistic & too bland. Favorite

Scene: The Rock-Throwing, reason: comedy given time to develop realistically, beyond highlighted "action". Only objection: Guitar music background to visuals of character walking down street.

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS: Again, from New York, an important ethnographic study. While plot construction a bit flacid in places, an important film, particularly for its vision of woman as determined to develop, capable of attempting change. The opening departure-scene of leaving "old ways" very successful, snapshot Godardesque. Other excellent scenes: Loosening her hair at air conditioner, turning light back on to survey progress in new apt. before going to sleep. Well-timed narratively, but could use some editorial tightening: when sense of "rebirth" becomes too positive and she is "dropped" from program. The film ends awkwardly, this almost implies that the makers couldn't continue financially just as heroine cut off from funds. In classroom the communication problems an excellent question to consider at end. In all, the"true" experience of this woman comes across as authentic, believable.

SAME DIFFERENCE: One of better "basic window genre" but more meditative/abstract in quality than most; raises the usual being-and-nothingness questions with unusual visual eloquence; but for this viewer its only power was hypnotic, like feedback-infinity in video.

THIRD LIFE: A "Dream of the Wild Dogs" - Here we can "see"/feel a dog's vision, memory, mental posture with filmmaker's use of very refined optical printing. When this worked, gave this viewer chills - to experience dog-souls, dog-dreams - unconscious. But too many conflicting visuals, structure too confused to sustain investigation of this one "viewpoint". Would suggest ommitting certain shots which lead viewer away from dog's point of view. Excellent track.

HOBART MILLARD: Almost too highly concentrated visually to make narrative sensible, too mannered to work well on first viewing. But power of romantic texture of imagry consistent. Least effective: Introduction (written) at beginning. Most effective: facial expressiveness, photographic portraiture expressed in glances, stares. Excellent editing rhythms. Somewhat marred by a muffled sound-track. Most sophisticated use of casting in festival.

CYBERNETIC LEGACY: Can't see the message for the trees; a well-shot one-liner. less might be more.

BLACK ORIFICE: Being a notorious sex-maniac, this judge felt it was best-of-show...at last, an implosion beyond the vaginal geometry of Busby Berkeley!

EXOTIC LIVE ACT: Montage hodge-podge; "cute" idea but not too exotic, after all. Could be half as long.

FIELD OF HONOR: Despite its sophisticated style and sense of tension, mystery between actors in beginning, this judge felt its original "message" was lost, empty; the film soon begins to resemble the worst of Hollywood: slick, jumbled, confusing, sophomoric humor, klutz-ish and an obvious waste of technical and human energy (not to mention money). Adequate acting and casting do not a movie make.

MARIE: "Wild waves beating on the shore make no sound unless they're heard". The filmmaker's intention to portray communication breakdown is confounded by the lack of initial "communication" which Marie might have had with other people (not just animals, nature.) A sense of loss gets through, however. Poor acting, interesting script, delicate plot construction with substantial "take" which serves as final exposition.

REALWORLD: So "silly" it's almost good but not good enough not to be "silly" with much style. Control-booth shots the weakest part of the film. Its strength lies in the accuracy of concept/depiction of NYC as an evil playground for nasty little boys. "Emergence" after "dive" might be best (strongest) sequence.

DISPARATES: Most evocative textural use of optical printing EFX in the show. Excellent word/concept games which become Wittgensteinian for a while, word-rebus like Arakawa canvases; then becomes overloaded with pretty-but-useless EFX in last half. Optical overkill almost undoes the cleverness of manipulation in first half.

FLAPPERETTE: Liked it a lot.

FATHER: Tender adolescence evoked, also formulation of the not-yet buried consciousness of pain is maintained through finely-handled acting, almost "underplaying" and gentle discipline over subject matter. Well structured textural differences in lighting-quality of "night" scenes. Subtle, well-mixed track.

APT. NO. 3.: Standardly well-shot but flat. Dull use of a soulful song. Some sexist indulgence, leaves us hungry but not for more.

MESSAGES: The old-fashioned flashback foregrounded the filmic material but narratively the film goes nowhere (flashes back to "somewhere" to re-arrive at "nowhere"; another nervous breakdown). Strong sexist implications that a woman can't live without a man. Water-bed shots especially re-enforce woman's impotency, lack of self-actualization.

HOOKERS: In this judge's opinion, Worst in Show. Visuals (generally poor) often belie meaning of what is being said: "that hookers are oppressed"; instead we see them as part of the upper middle class stereotype. This is pure exploitation; the "re-enactment" sequences are pure porn-propaganda; we almost expect to be given the girl's name and number. The trans-vestites at the Hooker's Ball (where are the Hell's Angels, the vidence which occured while I was there) only represent the very worst of pro-capitalist drag: an exagerated imitation of that which is the very "worst" in the popular image of American Woman. This film is an outrage: a commercial for sexism and TV ideology. It s lack of consciousness is a disgrace to those (my) SFSU students who participated in its realization. To perpetuate the system which evolved this image is to suppress the real suffering of women in this profession.

NOTES FROM THE BEAT GENERATION: A tremendously compelling topic which can't miss with any of us over thirty. Casting and decor superb. Shooting angle selection and length of takes a rigorous, suitable style, lend a documentary ontology to the piece. If the "visions of Cody" could sound like a "found" piece (ie, the "original" tape) the film would work beyond its built-in nostalgia. As it stands, is spoiled by bad sound.

SHEETS: Most delicately controlled lighting qualities in the entire show. In this film there is established an equivalent resonance between sound and lighting; delicacy of interior monologue also extraordinary. Only criticism here would be uneveness of content in poetic narrative which doesn't resolve into "readability", at times poetic narrative slows film image down but - filmic sensibility triumphs.

BETHLEHEM: Close to "pure" documentary verite: as measurement of a "space" which doesn't include the instrument of measurement: the camera. Camera and sound crew amazingly agile, technically proficient in spontaneous situ ations. Also, the institution was presented as an entire diogetic world of

visual space, a mimesis for the "real" world these children occupy outside of Bethlehem. Well structured, presents viewer with articulated, specific social questions.

WHY?: Excellent portrayal of visual wringing of hands, depiction of "inner" emotional state, we can almost "hear" "the voice within". But then one must ask, whom is she asking "why?", God? Philosophically this is conscious of anti-existential attitude but has too many menopausal reverberations to carry it much further. The image potentially "outruns" the message, its implications can be read as politically unsound; specifically, this can act as an image-model for immature middle age, as woman's angst, impotence. Well-made but thematically has a sexist subtext (beyond the anti-smoking ad phenomenon).

TRANSMAN: No comment.

SPECIAL NEWS REPORT: Clever. Its best feature is that it accepts (and thereby, transcends) being a student film; this is its great strength, its basis for operation; not to try too hard to be slick, authentic; it actually comes closer to objective humor and reaches levels of delightful absurdity in context of critiquing another medium. Well shot.

CR:11b
5/21/75

NOTES ON THE EIGHTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL STUDENT FILM FESTIVAL, HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY, 1975

FROM RAY KRIL, ASSOC. PROFESSOR AND FILM FESTIVAL JUDGE
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

Film should not be competition, it's a way of life.

Fantasy flicker fever took hold over quiet, often times foggy and slow Humboldt County May. Films from across the country arrived here with spring just in time to saturate the deprived film appetite. A splash of the unique, creative, different, weird, strange and terrible glitters from reflection to an awaiting audience for four straight dazz and not straight nights. It was an appreciative and receptive audience that sat through ten hours of a pre-screened film program as well as a final four plus hours of winners.

As a judge, I did not sit so much in judgement as a participant. My job had more to do with setting up a four-hour program than really judging which were best and better. The other two judges, Carel Rowe from San Francisco State and Don Lloyd from the San Francisco Art Institute, also seemed to have a similar attitude and understanding of our job. We decided to spread the prize money around somewhat democratically. After all, it is a depression time, and for filmmakers it seems like double hard times. We thought we could give at least the entry fee of $6. and $1.50 for postage, or $7.50, to every film that was selected by the pre-screening committee for screening Thursday and Friday. All films selected by us would get $7.50 more, or a total of $15. We then added additional amounts to films we wanted to endorse as outstanding work. They are encouragement prizes--encouragement to perhaps make another print so it could be shown more, encouragement to make another film. This kind of allocation broke down into what might be called four types of judged finishes: $7.50 prize meant rental and shown at the festival, $15.00 meant honorable mention, $20.-$30. meant Festival Award and over $35. meant Best of Festival. There were fifteen films that got rental, five films received honorable mention, six films achieved Festival Award and four films were honored as Best of Festival. I felt there should have been an audience-awarded award. This idea is being discussed for next year along with the idea that perhaps the films selected for final screening, after a week of audience pre-screening selection, should share equally in whatever the festival profits are--a co-op film festival. A jury could still honor special films with special mention and discussion.

The other judges have given detailed notes on most of the films shown. I would like to give an overview of what I saw, heard and thought.....

There were almost half as many films entered this year as last year. This might be due in part to the rising depression of the past year or a combination of poor publicity, conflicting festivals or fewer film students in this time of growing "practical job" syndrome. I've only been in the West Coast for a year now after spending time in the Midwest and being raised on the East Coast. For the year before coming west, I was in Europe, so the

so the festival was my first big shot of U.S. independent films in almost two years. It was of interest to me to note the difference between the East Coast School and the West Coast. The eastern school, well represented in the festival by N.Y.U., was much more into black and white--almost all were ethnographic in material. They tended to use their environment as a textural backdrop for a portrayal of life as it is. Struggle in the city (N.Y.) is a daily hard problem. Two of the Best of Festival films represented this flavor. Swag by Bruce Postman from N.Y.U. dealt with a sensitive portrayal of adolescent existence. It was well-acted, well shot and dealt with simple realities--survival. The other Best of Festival film from the east was also the only good "documentary" in the festival. The film was in black and white and followed a now familiar, but none-the-less difficult cinema verite style or direct cinema. The title tells us the location, Bethlehem, by Robert Thurber. It followed life in a boys home in the city. Most of the boys were teenagers and most were black. The film did an excellent job of pulling you into the conflicts, environment and sadness of the institution. One thinks of the Bazin quote, "would we know the day any better if there were no night...?" One of the guidelines for direct cinema is to establish non-preconception, the need for rapport with subject and observation without interference. Bethlehem achieves this. By achieving this the filmmaker was able to accomplish one of Richard Leacock's principles--that the direct cinema films are the audience...A recorded audience. The films are a way of sharing the filmmaker's audience experience. Bethlehem became one of the strongest political statements of the festival--condemning with its existence...portraying the complete lack of social telesis that has grown around us. All the other documentaries were either stylized for T.V. or straight-out contrived.

The other film from the east which won a Best of Festival award was "Father" by Stanley Solfas. I was impressed by the careful development he was able to achieve in this short, 8 minute, film. It moved with every art and again the subject was a sensitive portrayal of powerful life forces that all seemed to work.

The films from the West Coast tended to be more experimental in style or comic parodies. There seemed to be an indulgence in technical manipulation and contrived story boards. It was very obvious where most of the filmmakers in Southern California were placing their energies. There was no question of the Hollywood influence or the struggle to gain recognition by the same.

Perhaps the most impressive films in the festival used optical printing techniques to accomplish their vision quest. Sleep Walk by Michael Wallin won a Best of Festival award. It was the funniest film in the festival and never had to set up a comic structure. The film depended upon an almost Super 8 "Home movie" texture that through a seriew of optical printing steps developed a humorous look at a set of gestures. I saw this film four times. The images stayed with me and heighten my visual world. It also had an interesting sound track of voice over a careful combination of structured sound that amplified the image manipulation--a beautiful dealectical relationship on the structural use of sound--even the music worked. The other impressive optical films were Roseblood by Sharon Couzin, Cirque Memoire by Larry Huston, and IIIrd Life by Ron Finne.

I was impressed by the movement texture and feelings evoked from Roseblood. Roseblood was probably the best example of this style of filmmaking. The images seemed to roll off of the screen rather than being punched at you. Here again I felt the sound track, in particular an almost folk violin along with the dancing women lended a perfect dialectical structure. It was also a pleasing film that seemed to bring a variety of thoughts to the surface each time I saw it.

These are just a few of my impressions. The festival was a healthy experience which helped to reopen my mind and eyes.

RK:llb
6/2/75

Telephone (415) 479-1100 Ext. 2860

marin county fair

CIVIC CENTER
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA 94903

August 21, 1975

Mr. Michael Wallin
728A Castro
San Francisco, California 94114

Dear Mr. Wallin,

Thank you for your entry to the 5th Annual Marin County National Film Competition. We are pleased to inform you that your film has been accepted for screening at this year's fair. Enclosed is a list of those films which make up these screenings, and the jury's award decisions.

A few notes and comments:

--There were 146 films entered in this year's competition; 60 were entered under the independent category, 71 under student and 15 films in animation.

--We feel that the general quality of films submitted to us was substancially higher than that of previous years. We found a large number of well produced films.

--We were very pleased with the national participation this year; many films are being sent to us from places other than California and New York. This greatly enriches our competition.

Please accept our thanks for your participation in this competition and look for us again in '76.

Sincerely,

Cecil E. Riordan
Fair Manager

Robert Klein
Film Competition Coordinator

CER,RMK/rk

ENCLOSURES: List of Award Winners and Accepted Films
Courtesy Admission Pass for the Fair

Telephone (415) 472-2406
(415) 479-1100 Ext. 2860

marin county fair

CIVIC CENTER FAIRGROUNDS
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA 94903

National Film Competition

17 August 1975

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

The 5th ANNUAL MARIN COUNTY FAIR NATIONAL FILM COMPETITION announces the schedule for this year's competition. The winners of the competition, together with other outstanding film entries and a SPECIAL SHOWING of the EARLY FILMS of the SUCCESSFUL BAY AREA FILMMAKERS, John Korty, George Lucas and Francis Ford Coppola, will be screened daily during the Marin County Fair, August 28 to September 1, as follows:

PROGRAM NO. 1

First Award Independent	"Closed Mondays" Will Vinton & Bob Gardiner
Second Award Independent	"Trickfilm 3" George Griffin
Third Award Independent	"Centers of Influence" Ralph Arlyck
First Award Animation	"Kitsch In Synch" Adam K. Beckett
Second Award Animation	"Roll 'Em Lola" Fred Burns
Third Award Animation	"Aura Corona" Dennis Pies

These films will be screened at 1:00 and 4:00 pm on Thursday, August 28 and Friday, August 29, at 3:00 pm on Saturday, August 30, at 1:00 pm on Sunday, August 31, and at 3:00 pm on Monday, September 1.

PROGRAM NO. 2

First Award Student	"Eat the Sun" Jim Cox
Second Award Student	"Talk to Me" Alfonso R. Tatano
Third Award Student	"Swag" Bruce Postman

These films will be screened at 2:00 and 5:00 pm on Thursday, August 28 and Friday, August 29, at 5:00 pm on Saturday, August 30, at 12:00 noon on Sunday, August 31, and at 5:00 pm on Monday, September 1.

PROGRAM NO. 3

Special Showing	"You're a Big Boy Now" Francis Ford Coppola
Honorable Mention Independent	"Testament" James Broughton

These films will be screened at 1:00 on Saturday, August 30, at 4:00 on Sunday, August 31, and at 1:00 on Monday, September 1.

PROGRAM NO. 4

Honorable Mention Student	"Sleepwalk" Michael Wallin
Honorable Mention Student	"Process" David L. Robman
	"First Fig" Larry Cub & Gary Imhoff
	"A Field of Honor" Robert Zemeckis
	"Freefall" Larry Lansburgh & Brian Lansburgh

These films will be screened at 3:00 on Thursday, August 28 and Friday, August 29, and at 11:00 am on Saturday, August 30, Sunday, August 31, and Monday, September 1.

PROGRAM NO. 5

Special Showing	"The Emperor" George Lucas
Special Showing	"Language of Faces" John Korty
Honorable Mention Independent	"Undelivered: No Such Country" Ralph Arlyck
Honorable Mention Animation	"Euphoria" Vincent Collins

These films will be screened at 4:00 on Saturday, August 30, at 6:00 on Sunday, August 31, and at 4:00 on Monday, September 1.

PROGRAM NO. 6

Honorable Mention Independent	"Cycles" Jordan Belson & Stephen Beck
	"Metroliner" Victoria Hochberg
	"Tangrams" Alan Slasor

These films will be screened at 11:00 am on Thursday, August 28 and Friday, August 29, and at 12:00 noon on Saturday, August 30 and Monday, September 1.

For further information, please call 415-472-2406.

Telephone (415) 472-2406
(415) 479-1100 Ext. 2860

marin county fair

CIVIC CENTER FAIRGROUNDS
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA 94903

1975 FILM COMPETITION RESULTS

The following films have been accepted for showing at the 1975 Marin County Fair, with awards noted to the left of the films.

INDEPENDENT

First Award	"Closed Mondays"	Will Vinton & Bob Gardiner Portland, Oregon
Second Award	"Trikfilm 3"	George Griffin New York City, New York
Third Award	"Centers of Influence"	Ralph Arlyck Poughkeepsie, New York
Honorable Mention	"Testament"	James Broughton San Anselmo, California
Honorable Mention	"Undelivered: No Such Country"	Ralph Arlyck Poughkeepsie, New York
Honorable Mention	"Cycles"	Jordan Belson & Stephen Beck San Francisco, California
	"Metroliner:	Victoria Hochberg New York City, New York
	"Freefall"	Larry Lansburgh & Brian Lansburgh San Francisco, California
	"Tangrams"	Alan Slasor North Hollywood, California

ANIMATION

First Award	"Kitsch In Synch"	Adam K. Beckett Saugas, California
Second Award	"Roll 'Em Lola"	Fred Burns Berkeley, California
Third Award	"Aura Corona"	Dennis Pies Guerneville, California
Honorable Mention	"Euphoria"	Vincent Collins San Francisco, California

STUDENT

First Award	"Eat The Sun"	Jim Cox Seattle, Washington
Second Award	"Talk To Me"	Alfonso R. Tatano Cupertino, California
Third Award	"Swag"	Bruce Postman Oceanside, New York
Honorable Mention	"Sleepwalk"	Michael Wallin San Francisco, California
Honorable Mention	"Process"	David L. Robman Hollywood, California
	"First Fig"	Larry Cub & Gary Imhoff Venice, California
	"A Field of Honor"	Robert Zemeckis Burbank, California

SPECIAL PRIZE

Most Innovative Film: "Closed Mondays"

Total Films Entered: 146
Total Films Accepted: 20